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Author’s response to reviews: see over
We like to thank the reviewer and editor for their comments. Below our reply to their remarks.

Reviewer:
Thank you for asking me to review this revised submission. The authors appear to have answered my questions from my first review in a robust manner, and in my opinion these revisions have been satisfactory. The only additional comment I have is that on page 20 the timescale for the study is from January to December 2009 - I presume therefore that the study is already underway.

Our remark:
The study was indeed already on its way. We rewrote the protocol into past tense.

Editor:
We are pleased to accept your paper in principle and thank you for addressing the reviewers' comments. But before we can formally accept we need you to attend to the manuscript once again. Essentially, the overall standard of English is not of a sufficiently high standard. For example, there are several instances of overly informal wording or of poor sentence construction. In such cases we usually recommend that authors do seek a colleague (or co-investigator) who speaks English as a first language to make the corrections. This must be done to our satisfaction and is essential before we can accept the manuscript.

Our remark:
The manuscript is corrected by a translator.